



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,297	10/24/2003	Alon Elish	NSNP0001	1468

22862 7590 04/18/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP  
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L  
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
----------

COLAN, GIOVANNA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/693,297

Applicant(s)

ELISH, ALON

Examiner

Giovanna Colan

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is issued in response to applicant filed application on 10/24/2003.
2. Claims 1 – 46 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 3 – 10, 23, 26 – 27, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding Claims 3 and 26, the term “snippet” is not clearly supported in the specification. Examiner relies on the examples provided in the specification.

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Examiner asserts that all claims should be checked for clarification. Appropriate action required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 – 7, 14 – 20, 22 – 27, 31 – 32, 36, 38 – 40, and 43 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (Ferguson hereinafter) (Us Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997) in view of Apfel et al. (Apfel hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued: June 11, 2002).

Regarding Claim 1, Ferguson discloses an apparatus for capturing, organizing, and sharing information retrieved from a plurality of disparate data sources, comprising:

means for capturing a user selected piece of information that is accessed by said user during a browsing session (Col. 2 – 3, lines 67 and 1 – 5, Ferguson);

means for processing said selected information to store said selected piece of information, along with any other information previously captured by said user (Col. 15, lines 46 – 50, preset directories, Ferguson), in an integrated, user accessible file hierarchy (Col. 16, lines 40 – 42, Ferguson<sup>1</sup>), wherein said file hierarchy maintains said information without regard to said information format (Col. 4 and 18, lines 16 – 20 and 59 – 62; respectively, Ferguson);

Ferguson discloses all the limitations as disclosed above. However, Ferguson is silent with respect to editing selected information. On the other hand, Apfel discloses an editing system including means for editing any of said selected information via a common user interface (Col. 2 – 3, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, the document editor's user interface; respectively, Apfel); and means for organizing (Col. 8, lines 64 – 65, Apfel) and sharing said selected information (Col. 9, lines 14 – 16, Apfel<sup>2</sup>). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Apfel's teachings to the system of Ferguson. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Apfel (Col. 2, lines 44 – 50, Apfel), to provide sophisticated formatting and editing options in the context of the email environment and should provide message data in a format that is compatible with down level email clients, and to provide capabilities for minimizing interaction between the email client and the document editor, in order to increase system efficiency. In addition, both of the references (Ferguson and Apfel) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, databases management systems, document organization in hierarchical storages, and HTML documents. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 2, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, further comprising:

---

<sup>1</sup> Wherein directory corresponds to file hierarchy claimed.

means for generating a bibliography report (Col. 6 and 8, lines 40 – 43 and 30 – 33; respectively, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a apparatus, wherein said selected information is a snippet (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 4, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said snippet further comprises: metadata content (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 5, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said metadata content comprises: any of a source uniform resource locator (URL) address (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson), time (Col. 7, lines 51 – 55, view time, Ferguson), date (Col. 13, lines 22 – 24, Date Time Stamp, Ferguson), title (Col. 18, lines 63 – 65, Ferguson), author, user annotations, keywords, and custom information.

Regarding Claim 6, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said snippet comprises:

---

<sup>2</sup> Wherein examiner interprets the step of accessing information by client users as the step of sharing the information claimed.

any of an entire file (Col. 14, lines 7 – 10, entire page, Ferguson), and a portion of a file (Col. 14, lines 3 – 5, just the textual content of the requested page, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 7, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said file comprises:

any of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file (Col. 4, lines 18 – 22, Ferguson; Col. 11, lines 19 – 21, Apfel), an image file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, image, Ferguson), an audio file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, sound, Ferguson), a video file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, video, Ferguson), a flash file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, graphics, Ferguson), and a word processing file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, text, Ferguson; and Col. 4, lines 8 – 10, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 14, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said data source comprises:

any of a Web page (Col. 3, lines 1 – 5, a Web page, Ferguson), a Web file (Col. 4, lines 9 – 11, Web site which supports files, Ferguson), an email item (Col. 5, lines 10 – 13, E-Mail, Ferguson), a file system (Col. 24, lines 1 – 2, Ferguson), and a database (Col. 15, lines 20 – 22, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 15, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said capturing means further comprises:

means for selecting information to create said selected information (Col. 25, lines 55 – 58, Ferguson); and

Art Unit: 2162

means for enabling a drag and drop of said selected information into a destination directory (Fig. 8, item 251, Col. 27 and 28, lines 36 – 40 and 37 – 43; respectively, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 16, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said editing means further comprises:

means for editing said selected information (Col. 2 – 3, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, the document editor's user interface; respectively, Apfel); and

means for editing any metadata content associated with said selected information (Col. 15, Table II, lines 53 – 57, Apfel<sup>3</sup>).

Regarding Claim 17, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said editing means comprises:

any of an HTML editor (Col. 11, lines 15 – 21, Apfel), a text editor (Col. 16, lines 27 – 30, Apfel), and a media editor (Col. 14, lines 9 – 11 and 21, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 18, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said organizing means further comprises:

means for saving retrieved information in a destination directory associated with a category (Col. 16, lines 40 – 42, Ferguson).

---

<sup>3</sup> Examiner interprets the step of changing the properties as the step of editing the metadata claimed.



Art Unit: 2162

Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said destination directory comprises:

any of a local directory (Col. 19 and 20, lines 65 – 66 and 3 – 5; respectively, Ferguson) and a shared directory (Col. 16 and 17, lines 67 and 1 – 6, Ferguson<sup>4</sup>).

Regarding Claim 20, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, further comprising:

means for generating said bibliography report in a predefined style (Col. 8, lines 31 – 33 and 42 – 43, Apfel<sup>5</sup>).

Regarding Claim 22, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, wherein said means for sharing said information further comprises:

means for sending said information via an email system (Col. 5, lines 8 – 12, Ferguson; and Col. 2, lines 59 – 61, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 23, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus, further comprising:

a search engine for searching among said snippets (Col. 6, lines 48 – 51, Ferguson).

---

<sup>4</sup> Examiner interprets the step of utilizing the directories through a network as the step of utilizing a shared directory claimed.

<sup>5</sup> Wherein examiner interprets a specific type or class as a predefined style claimed.

Regarding Claim 24, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method for capturing, organizing, and sharing information retrieved from a plurality of disparate information sources in a plurality of different data formats, said method comprising the steps of:

selecting piece of information that is provided to a user during a browsing session (Col. 2 – 3, lines 67 and 1 – 5, Ferguson);

enabling said user to drag and drop said selected piece of information to a destination directory (Fig. 8, item 251, Col. 27 and 28, lines 36 – 40 and 37 – 43; respectively, Ferguson) which contains information previously selected by said user (Col. 15, lines 46 – 50, preset directories, Ferguson), wherein said directory maintains said information without regard to information format (Col. 4 and 18, lines 16 – 20 and 59 – 62; respectively, Ferguson);

any of determining and generating metadata content associated with said piece of selected information (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson);

providing said user with a means for editing said selected piece of information and said associated metadata content (Col. 2 – 3, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, the document editor's user interface; respectively, Apfel); and

processing said selected piece of information to store said selected piece of information in an integrated, user accessible file hierarchy comprising said destination

directory, along with said associated metadata content (Col. 16, lines 40 – 42, Ferguson<sup>6</sup>).

Regarding Claim 25, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said method further comprises the step of:

generating a bibliography report (Col. 6 and 8, lines 40 – 43 and 30 – 33; respectively, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 26, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said selected information is a snippet (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 27, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said snippet comprises: any of a file (Col. 14, lines 7 – 10, entire page, Ferguson), and a portion of a file (Col. 14, lines 3 – 5, just the textual content of the requested page, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 31, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said data source comprises:

any of a Web page (Col. 3, lines 1 – 5, a Web page, Ferguson), a Web file (Col. 4, lines 9 – 11, Web site which supports files, Ferguson), an email item (Col. 5, lines 10

---

<sup>6</sup> Wherein directory corresponds to file hierarchy claimed.

Art Unit: 2162

– 13, E-Mail, Ferguson), a file system (Col. 24, lines 1 – 2, Ferguson), and a database (Col. 15, lines 20 – 22, Ferguson).

Regarding Claim 32, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said data format:

any of an HTML file (Col. 4, lines 18 – 22, Ferguson; Col. 11, lines 19 – 21, Apfel), an image file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, image, Ferguson), an audio file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, sound, Ferguson), a video file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, video, Ferguson), a flash file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, graphics, Ferguson), and a word processing file (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, text, Ferguson; and Col. 4, lines 8 – 10, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 36, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said metadata content comprises:

any of a source URL (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson), time (Col. 7, lines 51 – 55, view time, Ferguson), date (Col. 13, lines 22 – 24, Date Time Stamp, Ferguson), title (Col. 18, lines 63 – 65, Ferguson), author, user annotations, keywords, and custom information.

Regarding Claim 38, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said editing means comprises:

any of an HTML editor (Col. 11, lines 15 – 21, Apfel), a text editor (Col. 16, lines 27 – 30, Apfel), and a media editor (Col. 14, lines 9 – 11 and 21, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 39, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, said processing step comprises the steps of:

adding HTML tags to said selected information (Col. 5, lines 13 – 18, Ferguson);  
converting relative URLs in said selected information to absolute URLs (Col. 9 and 10, lines 55 – 56 and 61 – 63; respectively, Ferguson<sup>7</sup>); and  
stripping embedded data from said selected information (Col. 10, lines 66 – 67, Ferguson<sup>8</sup>).

Regarding Claim 40, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said embedded data comprises:

any of Java scripts, JavaScript, frame images, images (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, image, Ferguson), and client scripts.

Regarding Claim 43, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, further comprising the step of:

packaging said destination directory content in a compressed file (Col. 19 and 20, lines 6 – 11 and 56 – 60, packet of data, Ferguson); and  
sending said compressed file as an email message (Col. 5 and 19, lines 9 – 10 and 6 – 11, packet received; respectively, Ferguson).

---

<sup>7</sup> Wherein examiner interprets the step of getting the local path of the URL and storing the obtained resources in a unique local path at the user's computer as the step of converting relative URLs to absolute URLs claimed.

Regarding Claim 44, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a method, wherein said destination directory further comprises:

at least one sub-directory (Col. 28, lines 37 – 39, Ferguson<sup>9</sup>).

Regarding Claim 45, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses a computer program stored on a tangible medium, wherein execution of said computer program implements the method of claim 24 (Col. 25, lines 45 – 48, Ferguson; and Col. 4, lines 42 – 46, Apfel).

Regarding Claim 46, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel discloses an apparatus for capturing, organizing, and sharing information retrieved from a plurality of disparate data sources, comprising:

means at a user system, operatively communicative with a browser at said user system, for capturing a user selected piece of information that is accessed by said user during a browsing session with said browser (Col. 2 – 3, lines 67 and 1 – 5, Ferguson);

wherein said user selection is accomplished by a gesture based highlighting of said piece of information and gesture based positioning of said piece of information within an information capture location (Col.5, lines 51 – 53, Ferguson);

---

<sup>8</sup> Wherein examiner interprets the step of deleting all files associated with a given download (URL) as the step of stripping the embedded data from selected information claimed.

<sup>9</sup> Examiner interprets "temporary internet files" included in c:\windows\temporary internet files\ as the subdirectory claimed.

wherein said piece of information comprises at least a portion of a discrete information element encountered by said user during said browsing session (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson);

means for processing said selected information to store said selected piece of information and associated metadata, along with any other information previously captured by said user (Col. 15, lines 46 – 50, preset directories, Ferguson), in an integrated, user accessible file hierarchy (Col. 16, lines 40 – 42, Ferguson<sup>10</sup>), wherein said file hierarchy maintains said information without regard to said information format (Col. 4 and 18, lines 16 – 20 and 59 – 62; respectively, Ferguson);

means for editing any of said selected information via a common user interface (Col. 2 – 3, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, the document editor's user interface; respectively, Apfel); and

means for organizing (Col. 8, lines 64 – 65, Apfel) and sharing said selected information without regard to said information format (Col. 9, lines 14 – 16, Apfel<sup>11</sup>).

7. Claim 8 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (Ferguson hereinafter) (Us Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997) in view of Apfel et al. (Apfel hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued: June 11, 2002) and further in view of Takahashi (Takahashi hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,727,999 B1, filed: October 5, 1999).

---

<sup>10</sup> Wherein directory corresponds to file hierarchy claimed.

Regarding Claim 8, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel ("Ferguson/Apfel" hereinafter) discloses all the limitations as disclosed above including image files (Col. 4, lines 17 – 18, image, Ferguson). However, Ferguson/Apfel is silent with respect to PDF, TIFF, Post Script, and RIP format. On the other hand, Takahashi discloses an image system including image file format, such as, a PDF (Col. 12, lines 51 – 52, Takahashi), TIFF (Col. 12, line 52, Takahashi), Post Script (Col.5, lines 38 – 40, Takahashi), and RIP format (Col.5, lines 48 – 49, Takahashi). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Takahashi's teachings to the system of Ferguson/Apfel. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Takahashi (Col. 1, lines 63 – 667, Takahashi), to provide an image formation system and to relieve a load of an user in case of mixing each of sheets, on which images are formed by separating jobs. In addition, both of the references (Ferguson/Apfel and Takahashi) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, image file formats. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 33, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel and further in view of Takahashi ("Ferguson/Apfel/Takahashi" hereinafter) discloses a method, wherein said image file format comprises:

---

<sup>11</sup> Wherein examiner interprets the step of accessing information by client users as the step of sharing the information claimed.



any of a PDF (Col. 12, lines 51 – 52, Takahashi), TIFF (Col. 12, line 52, Takahashi), Post Script (Col.5, lines 38 – 40, Takahashi), and RIP format (Col.5, lines 48 – 49, Takahashi)

8. Claim 9 – 10, and 34 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (Ferguson hereinafter) (Us Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997) in view of Apfel et al. (Apfel hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued: June 11, 2002), and further in view of Kobata et al. (Kobata hereinafter) (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0077985 A1, filed: October 16, 2000).

Regarding Claim 9, Ferguson/Apfel discloses all the limitations as disclosed above. However, Ferguson/Apfel discloses is silent with respect to MP3, WAV, SND, AU, and AIF format. On the other hand, Kobata discloses an audio and video system including image file format, such as, an MP3 (Page 9, [0108], line 4, Kobata), WAV (Page 9, [0108], line 3, Kobata), SND (Page 9, [0108], line 6 – 7, Kobata), AU (Page 9, [0108], line 6 – 7, Kobata), and AIF format (Page 9, [0108], line 5 – 6, Kobata). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Kobata's teachings to the system of Ferguson/Apfel. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Kobata (Page 1, [0011], lines 1 – 6, Kobata), to provide systems and techniques for controlling and managing digital assets; particularly when digital assets are transmitted electronically using, for example, the Internet, as these techniques serve to make the Internet secure for communication

Art Unit: 2162

and control of digital assets. In addition, both of the references (Ferguson/Apfel and Kobata) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, audio and video file formats. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 10, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel and further in view of Kobata ("Ferguson/Apfel/Kobata" hereinafter) discloses an apparatus, wherein said video file format comprises:

any of an MPEG (Page 9, [0108], line 4, Kobata) and AVI format (Page 9, [0108], line 2 – 3, Kobata).

Regarding Claim 34, Ferguson/Apfel/Kobata discloses a method, wherein said audio file format comprises:

any of an MP3 (Page 9, [0108], line 4, Kobata), WAV (Page 9, [0108], line 3, Kobata), SND (Page 9, [0108], line 6 – 7, Kobata), AU (Page 9, [0108], line 6 – 7, Kobata), and AIF format (Page 9, [0108], line 5 – 6, Kobata).

Regarding Claim 35, Ferguson/Apfel/Kobata discloses a method, wherein said video file format comprises:

any of an MPEG (Page 9, [0108], line 4, Kobata) and AVI format (Page 9, [0108], line 2 – 3, Kobata).

Art Unit: 2162

9. Claim 11 – 13, and 28 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (Ferguson hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997) in view of Apfel et al. (Apfel hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued: June 11, 2002) and further in view of Levett et al. (Levett hereinafter) (US Patent Pub. App. No. 2004/0148375 A1).

Regarding Claim 11, Ferguson/Apfel discloses all the limitations as disclosed above including a Web browser (Col. 3, lines 1 – 2, Ferguson). However, Ferguson/Apfel is silent with respect to a wireless application protocol (WAP) compliant browser. On the other hand, Levett discloses a browser, which comprises: any of a Web browser (Page 8, [0197], lines 3 – 5, Levett) and a wireless application protocol (WAP) compliant browser (Page 8, [0197], lines 8 – 9, Levett). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Levett's teachings to the system of Ferguson/Apfel. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Levett (Page 2, [0023], lines 1 – 5, Levett), to provide truly interactivity to manipulate data and to provide the evolution of the Web into a mainstream business and trading environment. In addition, both of the references (Ferguson/Apfel and Levett) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, database management systems, browsers, and search engine. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 12, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel and further in view of Levett ("Ferguson/Apfel/Levett" hereinafter) discloses an apparatus, wherein said WAP compliant browser is executed over any of a mobile phone (Page 5, [0120], lines 9 – 10, cell phone, Levett) and a personal digital assistance (PDA) (Page 5 – 6, [0120], lines 10 – 11, PDA, Levett).

Regarding Claim 13, Ferguson/Apfel/Levett discloses an apparatus, wherein said Web browser comprises:

any of Microsoft's Internet Explorer (Page 15, [0339], lines 2 – 4, Microsoft's Internet Explorer 4, Levett), Netscape's Navigator (Page 15, [0339], lines 2 – 4, Netscape's Navigator 4, Levett), and a custom browser (Page 6, [0121], lines 1 – 4 and 6 – 9, Levett).

Regarding Claim 28, Ferguson/Apfel/Levett discloses a method, wherein said browsing session is implemented with a browser, which comprises:

any of a Web browser (Col. 3, lines 1 – 2, Ferguson; and Page 8, [0197], lines 3 – 5, Levett) and a wireless application protocol (WAP) compliant browser (Page 8, [0197], lines 8 – 9, Levett).

Regarding Claim 29, Ferguson/Apfel/Levett discloses a method, wherein said WAP compliant browser is executed over any of a mobile phone (Page 5, [0120], lines 9

Art Unit: 2162

– 10, cell phone, Levett) and a personal digital assistance (PDA) (Page 5 – 6, [0120], lines 10 – 11, PDA, Levett).

Regarding Claim 30, Ferguson/Apfel/Levett discloses a method, wherein said Web browser comprises:

any of Microsoft's Internet Explorer (Page 15, [0339], lines 2 – 4, Microsoft's Internet Explorer 4, Levett), Netscape's Navigator (Page 15, [0339], lines 2 – 4, Netscape's Navigator 4, Levett).

10. Claim 21 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (Ferguson hereinafter) (Us Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997), in view of Apfel et al. (Apfel hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued: June 11, 2002), and further in view of Job-Slunder et al. (Job-Slunder hereinafter) (NPL: "User needs for bibliographic software", Kirk Job-Slunder, Greg Hanek, Hong Zhang; May 9, 2003).

Regarding Claim 21, Ferguson/Apfel discloses all the limitations as disclosed above. However, Ferguson/Apfel is silent with respect to MLA style, APA style, Chicago style, and user defined style. On the other hand, Job-Slunder discloses a bibliography predefined style comprises: any of an MLA style (Page 6, para. 1, lines 26 – 27, Job-Slunder), APA style (Page 6, para. 1, line 26, Job-Slunder), Chicago style (Page 6, para. 1, lines 28 – 29, Job-Slunder), and user defined style (Page 8, para. 2, lines 5 – 6,

Art Unit: 2162

Job-Slunder). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Job-Slunder's teachings to the system of Ferguson/Apfel. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Job-Slunder (Page 2, 3, and 9, para. 2, 4, and 1, lines 3 – 4, 8 – 10, and 8 – 10, respectively, Job-Slunder) to provide the ability to change the format of reference lists and in-text citations, to provide different bibliographic features, and to provide easy insertion of in-text citations and corresponding formatted references. In addition, both of the references (Ferguson/Apfel and Job-Slunder) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as generating reports, and editing data. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 42, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel and further in view of Job-Slunder ("Ferguson/Apfel/Job-Slunder" hereinafter) discloses a method, wherein said bibliography predefined style comprises:

any of an MLA style (Page 6, para. 1, lines 26 – 27, Job-Slunder), APA style (Page 6, para. 1, line 26, Job-Slunder), Chicago style (Page 6, para. 1, lines 28 – 29, Job-Slunder), and user defined style (Page 8, para. 2, lines 5 – 6, Job-Slunder).

11. Claim 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (Ferguson hereinafter) (Us Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997) in view of Apfel et al. (Apfel hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued:

Art Unit: 2162

June 11, 2002) and further in view of Omoigui (Omoigui hereinafter) (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0126136 A1, filed: June 22, 2001).

Regarding Claim 37, Ferguson/Apfel discloses all the limitations as disclosed above. However, Ferguson/Apfel is silent with respect to XML files. On the other hand, Omoigui discloses a method, wherein said metadata content is saved as an extensible markup language (XML) file in said destination directory (Page 20 and 40, [0358] and [0761], lines 1 – 5 and 1 – 2; respectively, Omoigui). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Omoigui's teachings to the system of Ferguson/Apfel. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Omoigui (Page 16, [0309], lines 5 – 13, Omoigui) to provide a set of rules or conventions (XML) for designing text formats that lets a user structure data without having to be a programmer, and to make it easy for a computer to generate data, read data, and ensure that the data structure is unambiguous. In addition, skilled artisan would have also been motivated to do so, in order to avoid common pitfalls in language design because XML is extensible, platform-independent, and it supports internationalization and localization. In addition, both of the references (Ferguson/Apfel and Omoigui) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, database management systems, web browsers, generating reports, and directories. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 41, the combination of Ferguson in view of Apfel and further in view of Omoigui ("Ferguson/Apfel/Omoigui" hereinafter) discloses a method, said step of generating said bibliography report comprising the steps of:

selecting a bibliography style from a predefined style (Col. 8, lines 31 – 33 and 42 – 43, Apfel<sup>12</sup>);

selecting a directory that comprises at least two snippets (Fig. 22, item 238, 240, 242, <http://www.smQ.com>, Col. 35, lines 34 – 38, Ferguson<sup>13</sup>);

composing a single XML file from all XML files included in said selected directory (Page 40, [0761], lines 1 – 4, Omoigui);

providing an extensible style-sheet language (XSL) engine with said XML file (Page 16, [0319], lines 1 – 3, Omoigui); and

generating said bibliography report using said XSL engine (page 16, [0318], lines 1 – 3, Omoigui<sup>14</sup>).

---

<sup>12</sup> Wherein examiner interprets a specific type or class as a predefined style claimed.

<sup>13</sup> Wherein Q-Touch1 and Q-Touch2 correspond to the snippets claimed.

<sup>14</sup> Wherein examiner interprets the XML vocabulary for specifying formatting as the report claimed.



***Prior Art Made Of Record***

1. Ferguson (Us Patent No. 6,769,019 B2, filed: December 10, 1997) discloses a method of background downloading of information from a computer network.
2. Apfel et al. (US Patent No. 6,405,225 B1, issued: June 11, 2002) discloses an integrating email functionality into a word processor by incorporating an email GUI within the word processor.
3. Takahashi (US Patent No. 6,727,999 B1, filed: October 5, 1999).
4. Kobata et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0077985 A1, filed: October 16, 2000).
5. Levett et al. (US Patent Pub. App. No. 2004/0148375 A1).
6. Job-Sluder et al. (NPL: "User needs for bibliographic software", Kirk Job-Slunder, Greg Hanek, Hong Zhang; May 9, 2003).
7. Omoigui (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0126136 A1, filed: June 22, 2001).


***Points Of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Giovanna Colan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Giovanna Colan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2162  
April 6, 2006

  
JOHN BREENE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100